

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on January 7, 2009 and to the Advisory Action mailed on March 31, 2009. An RCE is being filed along with this amendment. Claims 5-24 were pending in the Advisory Action and all claims were rejected. With the present response, claims 5-19 and 24 are amended, claims 20-23 are cancelled, claims 25-28 are new, and the remaining claims are unchanged. Consideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully solicited in light of the following comments.

In section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected all of the claims under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Meltzer et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6,125,391. This Amendment presents new limitations that have not been previously considered by the Examiner. This Amendment also presents new combinations and arrangements of limitations. Applicant respectfully contends that at least as amended that the claims are not disclosed by or obvious in view of Meltzer. Applicant therefore respectfully contends that the claims are patentable.

All of the claim amendments and new claims are well supported throughout the application as originally filed. Exemplary support for the claims is listed below.

Claim 5 has been amended to include the limitations previously recited in its dependent claims 9, 10, and 12. Claim 6 has been amended to include the limitations previously recited in its dependent claim 7. Claim 6 has also been amended to include the limitations of “the first computer sending the copy of the first computer’s process template to the second computer” and “the second computer retaining the copy of the first computer’s process template.” These limitations are supported for example in the specification on page 12, lines 10-12, page 14, lines 9-14, and page 16, lines 3-10.

The claim 7 amendment is supported for example by the illustrative embodiment of the limitation described on page 16, line 25 to page 17, line 3 of the specification. The claim 8 limitation is supported for example in the specification on page 16, lines 11-19. The claim 9 amendment is supported for example in the specification on page 12, lines 20-24. The claim 10 amendment is supported for example by the illustrative embodiment described in the specification on page 17, line 26 to page 18, line 4, and page 18, lines 18-20. The claim 11

amendment is supported for example in the specification on page 14, lines 3-9. The claim 12 amendment is supported for example in the specification on page 12, lines 20-24. The claim 13 amendment is supported for example in the specification on page 16, line 20 to page 17, line 3.

Claim 14 has been amended to recite that the first and the second computers each includes a plurality of applications. This is supported for example by FIG. 3 that shows a first computer having a plurality of applications 224 and a second computer having a plurality of applications 228. Claim 14 has also been amended to recite that the process template includes a rendering module that defines how each of the transaction documents is rendered in the plurality of applications. This limitation is supported for example in the specification on page 16, lines 11-19. Finally, claim 14 has been amended to include the limitation previously recited in its dependent claim 19.

Claim 15 has been amended to include the limitations previously recited in claims 16, 17, and 18. The claim 16 amendment is supported for example in the specification on page 15, lines 6-10. The claim 17 amendment is supported for example in the specification on page 15, lines 2-6. The claim 18 amendment is supported for example by FIG. 2 and in the specification on page 11, line 24 to page 12, line 12. The claim 19 amendment is supported for example in the specification on page 13, lines 2-11. The claim 24 amendment is supported for example in the specification on page 16, lines 13-19, and the claim 25 amendment is supported for example in the specification on page 16, lines 20-25.

Claim 26 is a new independent claim. The first four steps in the claim (i.e. identifying, defining, defining, and including) are supported for example in the specification on page 13, line 16 to page 14, line 2. The last six steps in the claim (i.e. storing, requesting, retaining, entering, validating, and sending) are supported for example in the specification on page 12, lines 5-24. The claim is also supported for example by the illustrative embodiment shown in FIG. 5 and described in the specification on page 17, line 15 to page 19, line 18.

Claims 27 and 28 are new dependent claims. Claim 27 is supported for example in the specification on page 18, lines 11-17. Claim 28 is supported for example by the illustrative embodiment described in the specification on page 13, lines 24-29. The claim is also supported

by the embodiment shown in FIG. 5 and described in the specification on page 17, line 15 to page 19, line 18.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are now in condition for allowance. Consideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited. The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /christopher l. holt/
Christopher L. Holt, Reg. No. 45,844
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

CLH:NKB:rkp